

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-3, 6-8, 12, 15, 16, and 19-26 were elected, and non-elected claims 4, 5, 9-11, 13, 14, 17, 18, and 27-43 are withdrawn.

By the foregoing Amendment, claims 1, 2, 9, 13, 20-22, and 32 have been amended, and claim 44 was added, leaving claims 1-44 pending. Support for the amendment can be found throughout the disclosure, for example in figure 1 and paragraphs 19, 22, 29, and 45 of the specification.

In numbered paragraph 4, claims 1-3, 6-8, 12, 15-16, 19-20 and 23-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,664,976 to Lofgren et al. (hereinafter "Lofgren"). Claims 21-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lofgren in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,288,686 to Josypenko (hereinafter "Josypenko"). These rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Without acquiescing to the merits of the rejection, independent claims 1 and 20 are amended.

Exemplary embodiments are directed to video on demand. In one example, Fig. 1 illustrates a first platform (e.g. 110) which can capture a stream of video frames and a second platform (e.g. 120) which can determine geo-location data. The geo-location data can be inserted into a video frame to generate a modified video frame. The geo-location data can be based on the geo-location data of a scene in the particular video frame. The geo-location data of the scene can be determined using at least positioning information of the second platform and a distance between a scene in a particular video frame and the second platform.

Independent claims 1 and 20 broadly encompass features of the foregoing. For example claim 1 recites a method for processing and outputting video frames. The method includes, among other steps, a step of receiving a stream of video frames from a first platform and a step of receiving geo-location data from a second platform. Independent claim 20 recites, in part, a receiver which receives a stream of video frames from a first platform and receives geo-location data from a second platform. Claims 1 and 20 further include a step and processor, respectively, that insert the geo-location data into a video frame to generate a modified video frame.

Lofgren does not disclose or suggest all the recited features of claims 1 and 20, for at least the following reasons. Lofgren discloses an image management system and methods using digital watermarks. In Fig. 1 of Lofgren, an image 10 is communicated to a receiving or ground station 12 where a watermark is embedded in the image to produce a watermarked image 13. The watermark of Fig. 1 includes a watermark identifier. Metadata such as geo-location information is stored in a separate database 14 which is indexed according to the watermark identifier. The metadata is not part of the watermarked image. Further, Lofgren does not disclose or suggest a platform of the geo-location information. At least because Lofgren does not disclose a platform of the geo-location information, there is further no disclosure of receiving geo-location data from a second platform which is different from a first platform from which a stream of video frames is received.

For at least the above reasons, Lofgren does not disclose or suggest a method or system including the features of receiving a stream of video frames from a first platform and receiving geo-location data from a second platform, and inserting

the geo-location data into a video frame to generate a modified video frame, as recited in independent claims 1 and 20. Hence, claims 1 and 20 are allowable.

The Examiner relies on Josypenko in an effort to remedy the deficiencies of Lofgren, as applied to claims 21 and 22. Applicants respectfully submit that Josypenko fails to remedy the deficiencies of Lofgren with respect to receiving a stream of video frames and receiving geo-location data as recited in claims 1 and 20. The Lofgren and Josypenko documents, when applied individually or in combination as alleged by the Examiner, do not disclose or suggest all of the features of independent claims 1 and 20, nor any of their respective depending claims.

For at least the above reasons, claims 1 and 20, as well as claims 2-19, 21-26, and 44 which depend therefrom, are allowable and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Request for Rejoinder

The Office made the restriction requirement requiring election of one of two alleged species final. The Office is respectfully requested to rejoin the currently withdrawn claims 4, 5, 9-11, 13, 14, 17, 18, and 27-43 upon allowance of a generic claim.

Claims 4, 5, 9-11, 13, 14, 17, and 18 depend from allowable generic claim 1. Once a generic claim is allowable, a reasonable number of the claims drawn to non-elected species, in addition to claims of the elected species, are to be allowed. See MPEP 806.04(d). Claims 4, 5, 9-11, 13, 14, 17, and 18 are directed to a reasonable number of non-elected species and are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon allowable claim 1.

Rejoinder of non-elected claims 27-43 is also respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully submit independent claim 1 and claim 27 are sufficiently related such that it would not be a serious burden to search and consider withdrawn claim 27, as well as claims 28-43 which are grouped with claim 27. In addition, the arguments presented above are applicable. Claims 27-43 should be rejoined and passed on to issuance along with allowable claims 1-26.

New Claim

New claim 44 is allowable by virtue of its dependency from allowable claim 1 and on its own merits.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections raised in the Office Action having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: Feb 20, 2009

By:



Patrick C. Keane
Registration No. 32858

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620